Grantee: Missouri

Grant: B-12-DT-29-0001

January 1, 2014 thru March 31, 2014 Performance Report



Grant Number: Obligation Date: Award Date:

B-12-DT-29-0001

Grantee Name: Contract End Date: Review by HUD:

Missouri Reviewed and Approved

Grant Award Amount: Grant Status: QPR Contact:

\$8,719,059.00 Active No QPR Contact Found

LOCCS Authorized Amount: Estimated PI/RL Funds:

\$8,719,059.00

Total Budget: \$8.719.059.00

Disasters:

Declaration Number

FEMA-1980-MO FEMA-4012-MO

Narratives

Disaster Damage:

Missouri was heavily impacted by severe storms, tornadoes and flooding that began on April 19, 2011. Southern and northwestern portions of the state were inundated with flood waters, while the cities of Joplin and Sedalia, and Jasper, Newton and St. Louis Counties sustained heavy tornado damage. These disasters resulted in 161 fatalities, 535 reported injuries, 10,443 destroyed or damaged homes, and impacted more than 500 businesses. Many of the counties included in the FEMA disaster declaration for Individual and/or Public Assistance are some of Missouri&rsquos most poverty-stricken.

>It is difficult to ascertain the magnitude of the impact that disasters in Missouri had during spring and summer 2011. DR 1980 included the Joplin tornado, which claimed 161 lives and destroyed approximately 1/3 of the city, southeast flooding (including the intentional breach of the Bird&rsquos Point Levee), and tornadoes in St. Louis and Sedalia. DR 4012 included Missouri River flooding in northwest Missouri. Housing: The 2011 Missouri Disasters had a significant impact on housing. There were 7,378 housing units destroyed, 1,092 with major damage, 1,973 with minor damage, and 2,647 considered &ldquoaffected&rdquo by FEMA. For DR 1980, about 56% of the housing units were insured.

Infrastructure: Flooding in Southeast Missouri impacted dozens of state and U.S. highways. Water over the roadways resulted in over 440 road closures at the peak of the flood, according to the Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT). This impacted not only inter-state travel, but also local travel for farmers and access to homes and industrial areas. In Joplin, the tornado path was large enough to affect many of the north/south transportation routes through town, and also at least some of the major east/west routes. In St. Louis, transportation was impacted on a large scale as Lambert-St. Louis International Airport&rsquos Concourse C took a direct hit from a tornado on April 22, 2011. Many highways in Northwest Missouri were closed for many weeks, including Interstate 29 at Rockport, US-136 at the Missouri River, US-159 at the Missouri River, and US-59 at the Missouri River. MODOT reported over 164 flood-related road closures at the peak of the Northwest Missouri flooding. In Joplin, three public schools were destroyed, one private school was destroyed, three other public schools had significant damage, and one private school had minor damage. ChildCare Aware of Missouri reported that Joplin&rsquos child care industry has been nearly cut in half. Before the tornado (as of 5/1/2011), there were 85 child care and early learning programs available in Joplin. After the tornado (as of 6/17/11), there were only 44. One hospital was destroyed, three long-term care facilities were destroyed and one was damaged. Joplin lost several group homes for people with mental and developmental disabilities.

Flooding has devastated fertile farmland in southeast and northwest Missouri. According to the Missouri Economic Research and Information Center (MERIC), Missouri ranks second in the nation in the number of farms, with 107,825. Missouri employs 298,320 workers in farms and agribusiness industries. The map at http://www.missourieconomy.org/pdfs/missouri_farms_and_agribusiness.pdfindica

Disaster Damage:

tes the prevalence of farmland in both southeast and northwest Missouri and the significance of agriculture to the economy in those areas. In 2008, Missouri&rsquos crop, livestock, processing and other agricultural sectors accounted for \$12.4 billion or, 7%, of the gross state product. >MERIC reports that between 2010 and 2012, employment numbers in the crop production industry in the state of Missouri decreased by 5.46%, indicating a negative impact by the 2011 floods.

>Projected Economic Impacts: More than 500 businesses in Joplin were either destroyed or otherwise impacted. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics data, the 500 impacted businesses represent 25% of Joplin&rsquos total employment (9,700 employees). Disaster events 1980 and 4012 included major flooding occurred along the Missouri and Mississippi rivers and also in Taney County. Tornados were also a major contributor to damages found in Joplin, Sedalia, and St. Louis. HUD&rsquos 2011 estimate of unmet needs for severely damaged homes and businesses totaled \$107,257,964; housing unmet needs totaled \$74,283,794 and business unmet needs totaled \$32,974,170.



>In 2011, damages to businesses and homes reduced profits and family incomes resulting in a decline in total economic activity in the state by \$81.8 million. In addition, Gross State Product (GSP) declined by \$52 million and Personal Income in the state declined by \$102 million. The loss to business profits and family income also resulted in over 800 job losses throughout the state.

>Other effects include crop losses from the Birds Point Levee Breach in 2011 that flooded over 130,000 acres of farmland and homes. Initially, FAPRI estimated a net loss of \$42.6 million in lost crop revenues to the Southeast Missouri region. The study had originally assumed that all 130,000 acres were unusable. Later reports reassessed the damage to acreage and determined that at least 90% of the acreage was used and did in fact produce crops. Given that 10% of the acreage turned out to be unusable, FAPRI&rsquos model would now reflect \$4.26 million in net losses to crop revenues.

>Combining the economic impact of business and home losses with crop revenue losses equates to a reduction in overall state economic activity of \$86.06 million.

Recovery Needs:

Housing Need: Even one year later, the rate of unmet needs remains high. As of December 2011, severe housing unmet needs were calculated by HUD at \$74,283,794. Of the 16,489 FEMA registrants for DR 1980, 43% of these registrants were ineligible for the Individuals and Households Program. Specifically, 41% were ineligible for the Housing Assistance Program. As of June 6, 2012, the U.S. Small Business Administration had received 1,848 applications for home loans and had only approved 605 of them, an approval rate of about 32.7%, leaving 1,243 (67.3%) requests unmet.

Infrastructure Need: Flooding, tornadoes, and severe storms caused numerous amounts of damage to infrastructure systems in Missouri during 2011. According to FEMA&rsquos Public Assistance assessments, the estimated total need for public assistance is \$177,781,945. This is broken down by category:

>&bull Category A (Debris Removal): \$67,837,716

>&bull Category B (Emergency Protective Measures): \$18,793,962

>&bull Category C (Roads and Bridges): \$32,336,757

>&bull Category D (Water Control Facilities): \$694,150

>It should be noted that the repair of levees, dams and flood control channels fall under Category D, but the eligibility of these facilities is restricted by FEMA. In Missouri, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will look to CDBG as a partner in levee restoration.

>&bull Category E (Buildings and Equipment): \$50,638,428

>&bull Category F (Utilities): \$6,047,955

>&bull Category G (Parks, Recreational and Other Facilities): \$1,432,977

Economic Need: The Department of Economic Development used an economic model to assess the impact to the region based on these unmet needs. The unmet needs of businesses were entered into the model as an increased cost in capital investment of \$32,974,170. Likewise, the unmet needs of housing affected the equity and rental incomes of property owners; the region&rsquos personal income was lowered in the model by \$74,283,794. Although agriculture is important to the economy in the northwestern part of the state, southeast Missouri relies heavily on agriculture as its economic base. In 2011, when the Bird&rsquos Point Levee was intentionally breached, thousands of acres of farmland were taken out of production for 2011. The State of Missouri intends to apply this post disaster analysis of the economic conditions of southeast Missouri and make available funding under the economic development category to address specific agriculture related job creation activities in a manner that leaves the communities in the area better positioned to meet the needs of their post disaster populations and prospects for growth. This category may solicit requests for proposal for economic development activities that allow for a broader approach to the agricultural industry supply chain which includes manufacturing of products grown in the flooded areas. Method of Distribution:

1. According to FEMA&rsquos Public Assistance assessments, the estimated total need for public unmet Housing and Business needs in the declared Missouri counties totaled \$107,257,964. Of this amount, \$74,283,794 was rela

Recovery Needs:

and \$32,974,170 was related to businesses. In addition, the total Public Assistance need for DR-1980 and DR-4012 is \$177,781,945. Due to the magnitude of the disaster events, and the massive amount of unmet need remaining, it is impossible to address all of these needs with available funding. DED will accept applications based on local needs and priorities for long-term recovery in disaster affected areas. DED has budgeted the following application categories:

Housing/Infrastructure: \$ 4,141,554

>Economic Revitalization/development: \$4,141,553

>Administration (state/local) - \$435,952

2. All applications for 2011 CDBG Disaster funding will be evaluated for:

&bull need (the breadth and depth of the disaster in terms of population affected and sectors (housing, infrastructure, business, environment) affected within the community;

- >&bull capacity (the degree of expertise and experience that the local government or contracted agency has to manage the project, administer the funds, and succeed with the outcomes and objectives defined in the application);
- >&bull the project&rsquos impact on short and long term community recovery (the amount of spin off, community awareness and support and degree to which the activities will lead to further recovery);
- >&bull local effort (other state/federal resources, local cash, human resources, in-kind efforts) and do the CDBG funds assist with non-federal share for FEMA and/or USACE funding;
- >&bull consistency with a local short and long term recovery plans;
- >&bull consistency with local and state floodplain management practices;
- >&bull project sustainability and future disaster mitigation (the degree to which activities are defined with sound construction practices, quality and durability, energy efficiency and flood control or flood resistance)

>&bull Available CDBG Disaster funds.

No maximum grant amount has been established for CDBG Disaster applications. Applicants must demonstrate financial need and leverage all (local, state and federal) available funds to minimize CDBG funding participation.

- 3. It is possible that the State (DED) will carry out an activity directly. This will depend entirely on need and applications received. Eligible activities will include housing, infrastructure and economic revitalization/development. The geographic area is limited to those areas included in Presidential Disaster declarations DR-1980 and DR-4012.
- >4. It is possible that the State (DED) will carry out an activity directly. This will depend entirely on need and applications received. Eligible



activities will include housing, infrastructure and economic revitalization/development. The geographic area is limited to those areas included in Presidential Disaster declarations DR-1980 and DR-4012. Any of the three CDBG national objectives may be used for activities carried out directly; however, at least 50% of the total allocation must meet the LMI national objective. Because of this requirement, recipients of CDBG Disaster funding should use the LMI national objective for all activities that qualify under the LMI criteria.

>5. All applicants for CDBG Disaster funding must demonstrate the relationship of the proposed activity ttediateeetadd

Recovery Needs:

cument how the proposed activity will assist in the long-term recovery from the disaster event.

- >6. The following are criteria used to distribute funds to local governments including the relative importance of each criterion.
- >&bull need (the breadth and depth of the disaster in terms of population affected and sectors (housing, infrastructure, business, environment) affected within the community (25%);
- >&bull capacity (the degree of expertise and experience that the local government or contracted agency has to manage the project, administer the funds, and succeed with the outcomes and objectives defined in the application) (10%);
- >&bull the project&rsquos impact on short and long term community recovery (the amount of spin off, community awareness and support and degree to which the activities will lead to further recovery) (20%);
- >&bull local effort (other state/federal resources, local cash, human resources, in-kind efforts) and do the CDBG funds assist with non-federal share for FEMA and/or USACE funding (15%);
- >&bull consistency with a local short and long term recovery plans (10%);
- >&bull consistency with local and state floodplain management practices (10%);
- >&bull project sustainability and future disaster mitigation (the degree to which activities are defined with sound construction practices, quality and durability, energy efficiency and flood control or flood resistance) (10%)
- 7. The following are criteria used to select applications for funding, including the relative importance of each criterion.
- >&bull need (the breadth and depth of the disaster in terms of population affected and sectors (housing, infrastructure, business, environment) affected within the community (25%);
- >&bull capacity (the degree of expertise and experience that the local government or contracted agency has to manage the project, administer the funds, and succeed with the outcomes and objectives defined in the application) (10%);
- >&bull the project&rsquos impact on short and long term community recovery (the amount of spin off, community awareness and support and degree to which the activities will lead to further recovery) (20%);
- >&bull local effort (other state/federal resources, local cash, human resources, in-kind efforts) and do the CDBG funds assist with non-federal share for FEMA and/or USACE funding (15%);
- >&bull consistency with a local short and long term recovery plans (10%);
- >&bull consistency with local and state floodplain management practices (10%);
- >&bull project sustainability and future disaster mitigation (the degree to which activities are defined with sound construction practices, quality and durability, energy efficiency and flood control or flood resistance) (10%)
 Definitions of disaster related activities:
- >All CDBG disaster recovery activities must clearly address an impact of the disaster for which funding was appropriated. This means that each activity must:
- >1. be CDBG eligible,
- >2. meet a national objective, and
- >3. address a direct or indirect impact from the disaster.
- A disaster related impact can be addressed through any eligible CDBG activity.

disaster, and how the proposed activities will address that loss/need.

>Housing &ndash Typical housing activities include new construction and rehabilitation of single family or multifamily unis.&a;bp;enerll,DBGisate

Recovery Needs:

recovery funds are used to rehabilitate damaged homes and rental units. However, it is also allowable to carry out new construction activities or rehabilitation of units not damaged by the disaster if these activities clearly address a disaster related impact. This impact can be demonstrated by the disaster&rsquos overall effect on the quality, quantity, and affordability of the housing stock and the resulting inability of that stock to meet post-disaster needs and population demands. The standard CDBG rehabilitation and reconstruction rules apply.

>Infrastructure &ndash Typical infrastructure activities include the repair, replacement, or relocation of damaged public facilities.

>Economic Revitalization &ndash Economic revitalization is not limited to activities that create or retain jobs. For CDBG disaster recovery purposes, economic revitalization can include any activity that demonstrably restores and improves some aspect of the local economy; the activity may address job losses or negative impacts to tax revenues or businesses. Examples of eligible activities include providing loans to businesses, funding job training, infrastructure improvements to commercial areas, and financing other efforts that attract/retain workers in disaster affected communities. All economic revitalization activities must address an economic impact(s) caused by the disaster (loss of jobs, loss of public revenue). Applicants for economic revitalization assistance must clearly identify the economic loss or need resulting from the

>Preparedness and Mitigation &ndash These funds shall be used for recovering from a Presidentially-declared major disaster. As such, all activities must respond to the impacts of the declared disaster. HUD and the State strongly encourage grantees to incorporate preparedness and mitigation measures into rebuilding activities, which helps to ensure that communities recovery to be safer and stronger than prior to the disaster. Incorporation of these measures also reduces costs in recovering from future disasters. However, given the limited funding available and the restrictions in the Appropriations Act, CDBG disaster recovery funds may not be used for activities that are solely designed to prepare for and/or mitigate the effects of a future disaster without any tie to rebuilding from the previous disaster.

>Tie to the Disaster &ndash Grantees must document in each application how the proposed activities are tied to the disaster for which public assistance is applied. In regard to physical losses, damage or rebuilding estimates are often the most effective tool for demonstrating the connection to the disaster. For economic or other non-physical losses, post-disaster analyses or assessments may best document the relationship between the loss and the disaster. Note that grantees are not limited in their recovery to returning to pre-disaster conditions. Rather, grantees are encouraged to undertake activities in such a way that not only addresses the disaster-related impacts, but leaves communities better positioned to meet the needs of their post-disaster populations and prospects for growth.

>Use of funds for other disasters not covered by the Appropriations Act &ndash CDBG disaster recovery funds may not be used to addressan impactorneedoriginating



Recovery Needs:

from a disaster not occurring in 2011. However, if a need that arose from a previous disaster was exacerbated by a 2011 disaster, disaster recovery funds may be used.

- >CDBG eligible activities
- >1. Property Acquisition
- >2. Property Disposition
- >3. Property Clearance/Demolition
- >4. Architectural Barrier Removal
- >5. Senior Center
- >6. Community Facilities
- >7. Centers for the Handicapped
- >8. Historic Properties
- >9. Water Treatment/Storage
- >10. Sanitary Sewer Collection
- >11. Storm Sewers
- >12. Flood and Drainage Facilities
- >13. Streets (or Roads)
- >14. Street Accessories
- >15. Parking Facilities
- >16. Bridges
- >17. Sidewalks
- >18. Pedestrian Malls
- >19. Recycling or Conversion Facilities
- >20. Parks and Recreation Facilities
- >21. Fire Protection/Facility Equipment
- >22. Solid Waste Disposal Facilities
- >23. Other Utilities
- >24. Public Service/Supportive Services
- >25. Rehabilitation of Private Residential Properties
- >26. Rehabilitation of Public Residential Properties
- >27. Payments for Loss of Rental Income
- >28. Relocation
- >29. Code Enforcement
- >30. Energy Use Strategy
- >31. Non-Federal Share Payment
- >32. Interim Assistance
- >33. Planning
- >34. Commercial or Industrial Facilities
- >35. Administration
- >36. Engineering/Design
- >37. Housing Rehab/Demo Inspection
- >38. Engineering/Construction Inspection
- >40. Audit
- >41. Port Facility
- >42. Airports
- >43. Natural Gas Lines
- >44. Electrical Distribution Lines
- >45. Rail Spurs
- >46. Lighting
- >47. Other Professional Services
- >48. Security Fencing
- >49. Site Preparation
- >50. Purchase Land/Building
- >51. Facility Construction Renovation
- >52. Machinery/Equipment
- >53. Working Capital
- >54. Sewage Treatment
- >55. LDC Homeownership Assistance &ndash up to \$15,000 to purchase a new home
- >56. Legal
- >57. 911 Emergency Systems
- >58. Homeowners Assistance- up to \$5,000 to purchase an existing DSS home
- >59. Lead-Based Paint Risk Assessment
- >60. Asbestos Removal
- >61. Job Training*
- >62. Home-Ownership Counseling
- >63. Substantial Reconstruction of the reconstruction of private residential properties on same lot- up to \$15,000
- >64. Water Distribution
- >65. Lead Reduction NOT incidental to Rehab
- >66. Asbestos Inspection
- National Objective
- >All three national objectives may be used with these disaster recovery funds: low and moderate income (LMI) benefit, slum and blight



removal, and urgent threat to health and safety. No less than 50% of the State&rsquos allocation of disaster recovery funding must be used for activities that meet the LMI national objective. Because of this requirement, grantees should use the LMI national objective for all activities that qualify under the LMI criteria.

Public Comment:

The draft CDBG Disaster Action Plan was made available on the DED website on July 6 for a seven day public comment period ending on July 12. The availability of the plan was made public via the DED Weekly electronic newsletter, and was also disseminated to local communities and other partners via the Missouri Municipal League and the regional planning commissions/councils of local government. No comments were received

Overall	This Report Period	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	\$8,401,476.00
Total Budget	\$0.00	\$8,401,476.00
Total Obligated	\$0.00	\$1,601,476.00
Total Funds Drawdown	\$10,440.35	\$180,684.25
Program Funds Drawdown	\$10,440.35	\$180,684.25
Program Income Drawdown	\$0.00	\$0.00
Program Income Received	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Funds Expended	\$10,440.35	\$180,684.25
Match Contributed	\$0.00	\$0.00

Progress Toward Required Numeric Targets

Requirement	Required	To Date
Overall Benefit Percentage (Projected)		65.16%
Overall Benefit Percentage (Actual)		100.00%
Minimum Non-Federal Match	\$0.00	\$0.00
Limit on Public Services	\$1,307,858.85	\$0.00
Limit on Admin/Planning	\$1,743,811.80	\$36,684.25
Limit on State Admin	\$435,952.95	\$36,684.25
Limit on Public Services Limit on Admin/Planning	\$1,307,858.85 \$1,743,811.80	\$0.0 \$36,684.2

Progress Toward Activity Type Targets

Activity Type	Target	Actual
Public services	\$1,307,858.85	\$0.00

Progress Toward National Objective Targets

National Objective	Target	Actual
Low/Mod	\$4,359,529.50	\$5,237,125.00

Overall Progress Narrative:

2012-DT-01 - Status of Safe Room Constructions by location: Cecil Floyd Elementary - roof work, interior slabs, brick exterior and interior partitions are complete; Eastmoreland Elemenary - Building envelope is complete and interior work continues; Jefferson Elementary - Site prep is near completion, waiting on precast; Junge Stadium



Fieldhouse - exterior and interior finishes are near completion; Kelsey Norman Elementary - Site prep is nearing completion, awaiting precast; McKinley Elementary - exterior finishes are complete, interior finishes are nearing completion; Royal Heights Elementary - Site work has begun and precast has been ordered; Stapleton Elementary - exterior work is complete and interior finishes are near completion. 2012-DT-02

2012-DT-03 - Awaiting documentation for most recent class of 16 training participants at the Newman Innovation Center. A total of 114 people have participated in the training to date.

2012-DT-04 - MO Dept of Natural Resources has completed plans and specs and project is awaiting approval. Construction permit is expected by early Summer.

Project Summary

Project #, Project Title	This Report Period	To Date	
	Program Funds Drawdown	Project Funds Budgeted	Program Funds Drawdown
2012 DT Admin, 2012 DT Admin	\$10,440.35	\$217,976.00	\$25,684.25
2012-DT-01, Joplin School District 2012-DT-01	\$0.00	\$2,800,000.00	\$0.00
2012-DT-02, Joplin 2012-DT-02-DEMO	\$0.00	\$4,000,000.00	\$0.00
2012-DT-03, Joplin Area Chamber of Commerce Foundation 2012-	\$0.00	\$975,000.00	\$143,500.00
2012-DT-04, Wyatt 2012-DT-04	\$0.00	\$408,500.00	\$11,500.00



Activities

()

2012 DT Admin / 2012 DT Admin Project # / Title:

Grantee Activity Number: 2011-DT-STADM

Activity Title: 2011 DT State Administration

Activitiy Category: Activity Status:

Administration **Under Way Project Title: Project Number:**

2012 DT Admin 2012 DT Admin

Projected Start Date: Projected End Date: 09/14/2015

09/14/2012

Completed Activity Actual End Date: Benefit Type:

National Objective: Responsible Organization:

State of Missouri

Overall	Jan 1 thru Mar 31, 2014	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	\$217,976.00
Total Budget	\$0.00	\$217,976.00
Total Obligated	\$0.00	\$217,976.00
Total Funds Drawdown	\$10,440.35	\$25,684.25
Program Funds Drawdown	\$10,440.35	\$25,684.25
Program Income Drawdown	\$0.00	\$0.00
Program Income Received	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Funds Expended	\$10,440.35	\$25,684.25
State of Missouri	\$10,440.35	\$25,684.25
Match Contributed	\$0.00	\$0.00

Activity Description:

The state has budgeted an initial 2.5% of the 5% cap for state administration. The balance of administration funds will be awarded to local governments once the projects are identified and agreements signed.

Location Description:

Activity Progress Narrative:



Accomplishments Performance Measures

No Accomplishments Performance Measures found.

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

No Beneficiaries Performance Measures found.

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources Amount

No Other Funding Sources Found Total Other Funding Sources

Project # / Title: 2012-DT-02 / Joplin 2012-DT-02-DEMO

Grantee Activity Number: DT-JOP06

Activity Title: Joplin DT-02-DEMO

Activity Category: Activity Status:

Clearance and Demolition Under Way

Project Number: Project Title:

2012-DT-02 Joplin 2012-DT-02-DEMO

Projected Start Date: Projected End Date:

02/01/2013 02/01/2015

Benefit Type: Completed Activity Actual End Date:

Area ()

National Objective: Responsible Organization:

Low/Mod City of Joplin

Overall	Jan 1 thru Mar 31, 2014	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	\$3,900,000.00
Total Budget	\$0.00	\$3,900,000.00
Total Obligated	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$0.00
Program Funds Drawdown	\$0.00	\$0.00



Program Income Drawdown	\$0.00	\$0.00
Program Income Received	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Funds Expended	\$0.00	\$0.00
City of Joplin	\$0.00	\$0.00
Match Contributed	\$0.00	\$0.00

Activity Description:

Demolition of approximately 125 structures/foundations/slabs/basements that meet the definition of blight.

Location Description:

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	1	9/125

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

No Beneficiaries Performance Measures found.

Activity Locations

Address City County State Zip Status / Accept

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources Amount

No Other Funding Sources Found Total Other Funding Sources

Monitoring, Audit, and Technical Assistance

Event Type	This Report Period	To Date
Monitoring, Audits, and Technical Assistance	0	0
Monitoring Visits	0	175



Audit Visits	0	204
Technical Assistance Visits	0	47
Monitoring/Technical Assistance Visits	0	4
Report/Letter Issued	0	0

